The Bushes New World Order and the United States Global Strategy

1989-2009

Ihmoud Ali Abusalim*

Abstract

This research paper is devoted to the description and analysis of the new world order and the US global strategy under the presidency of both former US presidents George Bush 1989-1993 and George W. Bush 2001-2009. The study focuses on the facts and arguments advanced with or against the US global strategy and its new world order after the 1990-1991 Gulf War and the end of the Cold War order 1990. The new United States role has been addressed in this study to analyze the reality behind the adoption of the NWO by president George Bush in 1991, the national security strategies of 2002 and 2006 by president George W. Bush as the basis of the massive use of military forces to create and protect a NWO that's suitable for it's future role in the world. However, an attempt has been made to ensure the questions of how and why the United States acted unilaterally and aggressively the way it did to dictate its policy on the world by the increasing reliance on the use of it's military power, its unilateral interventionist stance in many parts of the world, especially in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the division of the world into good and evil based on the assumption of "either you are with us or against us", so that there's no neutrality any more. States had no choice but to admit the power of America and its ability to enforce the roles on the others. The new United States world order is an order in which the United States is eager to globalize its values upon others to be universally good and should be accepted by all.

---

* قسم العلوم السياسية ، كلية العلوم الاجتماعية، جامعة مؤتة، الأردن.

تاريخ تقديم البحث: ٢٠/٥/٢٠٠٩.　　تاريخ قبول البحث: ٢/٨/٢٠٠٩.

Keywords: NOW= New world order, GA= Global strategy.

Mu'tah Lil-Buhuth wad-Dirasat, Humanities and Social Sciences Series,Vol. 25, No.4, 2010

النظام العالمي الجديد والاستراتيجية العالمية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية خلال إدارة الرئيسين الأمريكيين بوش وجورج دبليو بوش ١٩٨٩-٢٠٠٩

أحمود علي أبو سليم

ملخص

عمدت هذه الدراسة إلى وصف وتحليل الإستراتيجية الأمريكية العالمية في عهد كل من الرئيس الأمريكي الأسبق جورج بوش ١٩٨٩ – ١٩٩٣، والرئيس جورج دبليو بوش ٢٠٠١ – ٢٠٠٩ منذ انهيار نظام الحرب الباردة ونظام الثنائية القطبية عام ١٩٩١، ومن ثم اعتماد الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية في عهد كلا الرئيسين إستراتيجية عالمية جديدة تتمثل بتبني نظام عالمي جديد وإستراتيجية أمريكية عالمية تعتمد كلياً على القوة العسكرية في تحقيق أهداف السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة. ولقد ركزت الدراسة على وصف دوافع وآليات السياسة العالمية للولايات المتحدة وتحليلها واعتمادها منهج القوة في تحقيق سياساتها العالمية في العالم بشكل عام وفي العالم الثالث بشكل خاص. ولقد كان الاحتلال الأمريكي لأفغانستان والعراق والتبريرات الأمريكية التي بنيت على ما يسمى بمنع انتشار أسلحة الدمار الشامل، كما كان الحال في المسألة العراقية، ومحاربة الإرهاب كما كان الحال في المسألة الأفغانية، ومن ثم تقسيم العالم إلى محور مقبول وآخر مرفوض من قبل الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية دوراً في اعتماد فرضية "من لم يكن معنا فهو ضدنا".

ولقد خلصت الدراسة إلى أن الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية في عهد كلا الرئيسين جورج بوش وجورج دبليو بوش قد أرادت عولمة الأيديولوجية والقيم الأمريكية على أنها تصلح عالمياً وأن على العامل تبني النموذج الأمريكي حيث سعت إدارة الرئيسين إلى تطبيق ذلك منفردة معتمدة على مقدراتها العسكرية الأقوى في العالم.

الكلمات الدالة: نظام عالمي – جديد، الإستراتيجية العالمية.

Introduction:

It was George Bush Sr. 1989-1993 who announced the New World Order right after the United States lead war against Iraq in the 1990-1991 Gulf War. Followed by the peaceful disintegration of the former Soviet Union 1991, the Cold War order has come to an end; the United States has won the war, and become the only super power of the world. Its unchallenged military power and its leadership have driven it to play a more active role in world politics. To continue to lead and or somehow dominate the world, the superiority of its military power must be enhanced to be used as an instrument of its foreign policy and global strategy. This on the other hand, will advance the United States ability, may be its desire to act unilaterally, once it's necessary to do so. Relying heavily on its military power, creating conditions in many parts of the world; intervene in almost each and every crisis anywhere in the world; expanding the NATO power under its leadership, and cooperation and somehow managing the path of the United Nations, are a combination of policies that have been adopted by the Bush's administration to serve the new United States strategy to the new world order.

Purpose of the Study:

The main purpose of this study is to critically examine the United States global strategy and its favorable new world order under the presidency of both former United States presidents George Bush 1989-1993 and George W. Bush 2001-2009. The study will first examine the competing paradigms and or approaches to the study of international relations in general. Efforts will be made to find out which theory and or approach will be more applicable to describe and analyze the United States global strategy and objective.

Research Questions:

Since the purpose of the study is to explore and analyze the main objectives of the United States global strategy under the former presidents Bush Sr. and Bush Jr. The following research questions will be addressed:

1. What was the United States post- Cold War world strategy?

2. Did the aftermath of the 1990-1991 Gulf War and the collapse of the former Soviet Union create a new era replacing the balance of power equation to a new era of one world power, so the United States must act accordingly?

3. Was the Bush Sr.'s new world order a result of post-cold war strategy?

4. Where the *9111th* events a turning point in the United States global strategy.

5. Where the 9/11th events a fabrication that was made to legitimize the United States interventions in many parts of the world, particularly in Afghanistan and Iraq, and then its global war on terror?

Research Methodology:

This study will be based on the assumption that the United States global policy can be analyzed on the premises of the state, power, balance of power, national interests, globalism, and somehow, conspiracy may also be addressed in this study. However, the study will examine the competing approaches suggested by scholars and political analysts so far in order to determine which approach or methodology that might help describe and then analyze the main purpose of this study.

However, a descriptive and analytical method will be used in this study to describe and then analyze the United States global policy under the presidency of both former United States presidents George Bush Sr. and George W. Bush Jr. The following exploratory hypothesis will be examined:

1. The post-Cold War United States strategy was to establish a new world order in the sense of United States military power domination.

2. The 9/11th events of 2001 were a fabrication to legitimize the Bush Jr. unilateral interventionist stance in both Afghanistan and Iraq and his policy of global war on terror

.

Theoretical Framework:

International relations theories attempt to provide a conceptual framework upon which international politics can be analyzed. Each theory is reductive and essentialist to different degrees, relying on different sets of assumptions respectively. It should be noted that the character of the assumptions made by an international relations theory also determine its usefulness. These theories are not absolute facts. However, despite the usefulness of them as a tool of analysis, there are still many who doubt the credibility of these theories to fiilly explain the reality and dynamics of states reactions in a certain given situation. Therefore the study of international relations has become a phenomenon that most scholars and policy makers find so difficult to stand on one position and confidentially support his or her argument, or even assumptions.

Within this complexity, a group of scholars who doubted the efforts made by others to research a common ground of conceptual thinking to explain the reality of world politics were those who believe in conspiracy theory as a tool of analysis. In international relations theory, the term new world order refers to a new era in history evidencing a dramatic change in world political thought and the shift in the balance of power equation. However, in conspiracy theory, the term new world order refers to the advent of a cryptoeratic or totalitarian world government.[(1)]

Actually, there is a common ground between the conspiracy theories and the globalists who both believe in placing the world under one system or government. In the past, the conspirator who were usually said to be underground or secret communist supporters were intending to bring the capitalist world, especially the United States, under a common world government with the Soviet Union, but the dissolution of the former Soviet Union in 1991 undercut that theory. So most of the conspiracy theorists shifted their focus to the United Nations as an alternative player, despite its weekness.[(2)] However, with powerlessness and unwillingness of the United Nations, would the United States use the United Nations to legitimize its new role to govern the world?

In fact the unpredictable changes in the traditional world order that dominated the international relation and world politics during the Cold War era, all theories and assumptions made during that period, all predictions and analysis are now being questioned.

Howard J Wiarda (1996) has argued that 'The outstanding events of 1989- 1990, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, and the unraveling of the Soviet Union, changed the face of the globe and left the United States without its historic Cold War enemy. Closely following the Soviet Union into eclipse was the strategy of global containment that had served as the main foundation of the United States strategic policy since its initial formulation in 1946. Howard also remarks that 'The end of the Cold War forced the United States and all other nations to rethink entirely their foreign policy assumptions and strategies. Everything had turned topsy-turvy; none of the Cold War assumptions or theories was serviceable anymore. Even the US government, which had been geared to Cold War struggle for forty five years, required restructuring. "(4)

, international relations theories attempt to provide a conceptual model upon which international relation can be analyzed. Reus Smith (2005) quoting Ole Holsti describes them as , "International relations theories act as a pair of colored sunglasses, allowing the wearer to see only the salient events relevant to the theory. An adherent of realism may completely disregard an event that a constructivist might pounce as crucial, and vice versa"(5)

However, to come up with a conceptual theoretical framework, this study will discuss the key components and assumptions of one principle international relations theories, realism and power theory as tools of analysis to the subject of this study.

Realism and Power Theory:

State has been considered by the realists in addition to other theorists, as the major actor in the international political arena. Conducting its foreign policy strategy in a manner to actively enhance, and secure its national interests, in which states adopt strategies as a plan of action designed to achieve its stated goal. However, as an instrument of the state, power is a crucial variable determine the state capabilities to act internationally.

Realism makes several key assumptions as follows:

1. State as unitary rational actor pursing the "national interest".

2. Power is the crucial variable prompting the dynamics of international relations.

3. National Power can be measured in absolute or relative terms and is comprised of a series of national capabilities or attributes.

4. Anarchy (the absence of a unifying-hegemonic-authority) distrust, and suspicion (the security dilemma) characterize the international political system.

5. Balance of power whether established voluntarily or by a systematic process of homeostasis.

6. Interdependence, dependency, and hegemony are key components of the balance of power.

7. There is a distinction between high politics and low politics.(6)

Going through the several key components and assumptions made by realism, one can find out that state and power were the main theme of this theory and its application in the international system. The basic contentions of this theory were state, power, and national interests, although hegemony is one of the key components of balance of power. Therefore, it might be suitable to agree that the new world order adapted by the United States, using its military power, legitimizing its international interventions to defend and secure its national interests has been carried out by both former US presidents George Bush and George W. Bush within this context. This on the other hand, will explain the way in which the United States acts internationally. Its new role in the world and its global strategy almost completely relied upon the superiority of its military power.

Power theory analyzes the states behavior within the international system by the motives of the state to gain and improve its power capabilities as a crucial factor promoting the dynamics of international relations and therefore, the states quest for world hegemony. As Hans J. Morgenthau (1985) put it, states as the main actor in the international system acts and interacts within the system and their capacity to influence it depends on their power capabilities, therefore the foreign policy of the state seems to be always guided by its national interests and the means of its power.

As mentioned before power is a crucial variable in promoting the dynamics of international relations. It may be defined broadly as "the ability

of an actor on the international stage to use tangible and intangible resources and assets in such a way as to influence the outcomes of international events to its own satisfaction.(8) As for the realists, according to Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi (1987) power has been defined as "the sum of military, economic, technological, diplomatic and other capabilities at the disposal of the state. However, others see power not as some absolute value determined for each state as if it were in a vacuum but, rather as capabilities relative to the capabilities of other states. Thus the power of the United States is evaluated in terms of its capabilities relative to the capabilities of the Soviet Union and other states.' The United States is not an exception here; power has been the key component of the United States world view. As Walter S. Jones (1988) put it: 'The image of the international aggressor is an important component of the American belief system. The aggressor is a bully who employs military threats and actions to subdue weaker states and to seize from them any assets he wishes. He is immune to normal justice and regards international law and morality as mere sentimentality. He uses propaganda to conceal his intentions, and he regards agreements and treaties as mere expedient rather than obligations'

To elaborate on this, it can be said that the United States who had no colonial experience before 1991, with the exception of the Korean and Vietnam Wars, now under the presidency of both former presidents, George Bush and George W. Bush, just doing the aggressor role. It is Bush Senior's new world order, the quest for world hegemony; and it is Bush juniors national security strategies of 2002 and 2006, and its war on terror, the occupation of powerless states like Afghanistan and Iraq 2003, that are in fact, the most sweeping reality of the colonial empire that have been practiced by the United States, under the presidency of both former President, George Bush, and George W. Bush

The New World Order and the United States Global Strategy: From George Bush to George W. Bush 1991-2009

The most dramatic change in the international environment has been the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the end of the Cold War. In addition, the American swift and decisive victory over Iraq in 1990-1991

Gulf War remarks the emergence of the United States as, not only a global power but in fact, the unchallenged power of the world. However, the end of the Cold War order and its containment policy in which it was the cornerstone of the US foreign policy since 1946 until it was over in 1991, had suddenly become outdated and irrelevant. Therefore, the questions of what United States policy should be in the light of new international relations?

This appears to create a vacuum of policy which urged the on going debate among the American public and policy makers alike of what is the future role of the United States should be. The debate goes as the isolationists who have deep roots in the United States as conservatives who, for more than forty five years of the Cold War, favored the active projection of the United States power abroad, but who, with the end of the Cold War, questioned that position. For some conservatives, it seems, containment of the former Soviet power was the only goal that could justify a sustained American commitment abroad.(11)

According to Owen Harries (1991), the enduring, historically conditioned divides of the United States policy-internationalism versus isolationism and idealism versus realism were reflected in the commentaries on the Gulf War and the new world order. Also reflected were dimensions of conservative and liberal opinions. (12) With the end of the Cold War, conservatives ought to redouble their efforts to achieve the domestic goal and not to sacrifice this purpose to more international involvement or global empire. Domestic issues became more attractive now than ever before. Since the fear of the Cold War and the Soviet threats no longer exist, the United States must make major adjustments in its foreign policy/ However, has the US foreign policy been adjusted to reduce its international involvement to more domestic issues? Was the idea of "America First" raised up again? Or it was more American international involvement, a moment of opportunity for world leadership and the idea of "America only" so the "Pax American" the "do it alone" -the world policemen- and finally the world hegemony will be the slogan of the US foreign policy and future global strategy, and its relative terms, the new world order.

1. George Bush Senior 1989-1993 and the new world order

It was George Bush Senior who proclaimed a new world order after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. So what does Bush's new world order

mean? Is it a world order in the sense of "America Only"? Or is it an order of "either you stand with us or against us"? During the Gulf Crisis of 1990-1991, the new world order appeared quite suddenly to have become the United States foreign policy. Created with superiority and military force during the Gulf War of 1990-1991, it was pressed into service provisionally to provide a foreign policy that could be sold to the American public, replacing the Cold War containment policy. It was clear, however, that to be useful as a future policy it needed more definition.(14)

In an article published by Tomas Friedman, a New York Times editorial writer, February, 7, 1992, "Beauty of Containment", Friedman noted that containment had a "straight forward logical and served as a seemingly easy guide for policy makers." It directed them to what was important, what was a threat to American security and interests, and where they should put their resources. Its salience was that it defined US foreign policy as one used to galvanize the public."[15] However, the end of the Cold War has put the international agenda in a cross road in which the United States, who claim victory over the Soviet Union and showed a military and diplomatic leadership in the 1990-1991 Gulf War, must act not only by choice but, as the former president of the United States George Bush had described it, as a duty and United States obligation to the world. The post-Cold War world has freed the Bush administration to depart from routine and institutionalized lines of policy that were held for over four decades, to adopt of what foreign policy is likely to replace the traditional American grand strategy of global containment.

According to Kenneth A. Oye (1992) in his effort to answer the question of "what lines of policy are likely to endure?" he considered three scenarios as follows:(16)

1. Habitual Hegemony: Military and Economic unilateralism. Kenneth has argued that many American analysts contend that the United States is bound to lead in the new world order. The old postwar order with the collapse of bipolarity, as he refers to Joseph Nay and others, "the new world order began at a moment of unipolarity. American dominance in military if not economic terms was undiscovered by the swift American military victory in the Gulf War. " will the United States simply continue to pursue old policies in a new international environment?

2. Praetorian Partnerships: Military and Economic Multilateralism. To alleviate economic burdens of leadership while promoting global stability, the United States may shift toward explicitly multilateral strategies.

3. Reactive Retrenchment: Regionalism:

The problems associated with the first two scenarios are substantial and the initial policies of the early Bush administration may not hold. The United States may well turn away from hegemonic and multilateral conception of the new world order and toward old fashioned isolationism and regionalism.(17)

To elaborate on Kenneth's suggested scenarios, it should be noted that the Bush administration will never give up the first scenario of unilateralism. By its military superiority and its quest for world hegemony, America only, has been clearly addressed by the Bush administration and what it meant by its new world order. The United States global strategy during the senior Bush administration was loudly announced by the president declaring the United States role in the world. In his speech on March 10, 1992 he said: "America retained its position as the one and only unrivaled super power... we will retain the preeminent responsibility for addressing selectively those wrongs which threaten not only our interests, but those of our allies or friends, or which could seriously unsettle international relations."(18)

Taken together, the Gulf War and the collapse of the Soviet Power offer a new opportunity to share more widely the responsibility for keeping the peace. However, in the wake of the Cold War, President George Bush calls for America to take its place in a new world order. He was very insistent on a policy of " America only" and the "go-it alone" relying heavily on the defense department alone to define the terms of national debate on United States global strategy after the Cold War. The defense strategy objectives issued by the Pentagon's plan as a preventive policy to prevent the emergence of a new rival, either in the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere, that poses a threat on the order of that posed previously by the former Soviet Union. This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power. These regions

include Western Europe, East Asia, the former Soviet, and South-West Asia.[19]

In addition to the above mentioned objectives; there are three additional aspects to it. First, the United States must show the leadership necessary to establish and protect a new world order that wholes the promise of convincing potential competitors that they need not aspire to a greater role or pursue a more aggressive posture to protect their legitimate interests. Second in the non-defense areas, the United States must account sufficiently for the interests of the advanced industrial nations to discourage them from challenging the United States leadership or seeking to overturn the established political and economic order deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role.[20]

It's quite clear now that the United States global strategy under the George Bush administration was aimed to establish a new world order in the sense of world superiority and world domination. Looking at the Pentagon plan for the further role of the United States, some might add that the United States quest for world leadership has now been achieved. However, the fact is, to keep the leadership equation intact, the United States must act unilaterally relying heavily on the use of its military forces to be involved in almost any crisis around the world by implementing "either you stand with us or against us".

Despite its military power superiority and its ability to command and control the dynamics of international relations, the question remains that would the United States continue to play the role? Will the "America only" stand and for how long? What about the heavy burdens upon the United States economy by continuing the "do-it alone" policy? Would the United States be willing to share with others without losing its hegemonic role?

To answer theses questions, the second scenario suggested by Kenneth; praetorian partnership: Military and economic multilateralism- will be addressed, in order to come up with a comprehensive analysis to the United States global role in the new world after the Soviet. According to Kenneth, 'To alleviate economic burdens of leadership while promoting global stability and openness, the United States may shift towards explicitly multilateral strategies of a most peculiar form"[2i] Using the Gulf Crisis- the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait August 2$_{n}$d 1990- Kenneth has noted that "consider the nation of "comparative advantage" that lies at the core of

American policy towards Kuwait, the precursor of a multilateralism military grand strategy. The United States provided the lion's share of troops and weapons while Saudi Arabia and Japan provided the lion's share of the funds. Allied pledges to the United States to offset the cost of Operation Desert Storm totaled $41.7 billion, including $5.5 billion from Germany, $9.0 billion from Japan, $280.0 million from South Korea, $2.5 billion from Kuwait, $3.3billion from Saudi Arabia, and $1.0 billion from the United Arab Emirates. If all of these pledges are honored, allied economic contributions may more than offset the direct American economic costs of the war." Accordingly, such praetorian partnerships may permit the United States to expert substantial influence on international military affairs without accelerating American relative economic decline. The second segment of the multilateralism and partnership scenario was international diplomatic supports and international legitimacy.

The creation of the new world order was specified as an objective by the former president of the United States, George Bush Senior. This Bush's new world order was born from the ashes of the 1990-1991 Gulf War. In his words to the Congress in September 1990, president Bush Senior said: "We stand here today at a unique and extraordinary moment. The crisis in the Persian Gulf[†] offers a rare opportunity to move toward a historic period of cooperation. Out of these troubled times, our fifth objective. A -new world order- can emerge; a new era in which nation of the world can prosper and live in harmony." This new world "struggling to be born" would be quite different from the one we had known, he said. It would be a world of peace, where the rule of law supplants the rule of the jungle, a world in which notions recognize the shared responsibility for freedom and justice, a world where the strong respect the rights of the weak." (23) When the war of 1990-1991 is over, Bush-Senior claimed that 'The first test of the new world order had been passed."(24) The other four objectives mentioned by President Bush were the Iraqi immediate withdrawal from Kuwait; the restoration of the legitimate government of Kuwait; assurance of the security and stability of the Gulf; and protection of United States citizen abroad. Very skillful diplomatic missions have been carried out by president Bush Senior to get international support for his reaction to the Gulf Crisis. He successfully convinced leaders around the world, including the Soviet Union, to support

† Persian Gulf is a phrase used by all Western and US literatures as an official name to the Arabian Gulf in which all Arabs, officials, and academics alike refer to.

the ejection of Iraq out of Kuwait by all means necessary including the use of force. Although, to legitimize his act, he turned to the United Nations and its instrument, the Security Council. The number of resolutions passed by the Security Council, including resolution 678 authorizing the use of military force to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait were in fact a diplomatic victory for the United States. However, was the United States using the United Nations for its purposes, was the United Nations being used as an instrument to legitimize the United States new role in the new international environment?

As Ken Mathews (1993) has put it, 'The United Nations as a body is not independent nor does it have independent interests or capacity to act. Thus it's of course unrealistic to expect action by the United Nations but rather action through the United Nations. The national tendency of the United Nations is for, indecision, prevarication, and action in accordance with the lowest common denominator. The fact that the Gulf War Crisis promoted uncharacteristic qualities of action, determination and clear sight was due to a particular constellation of force at the time. "[25] Ken has argued that the most plausible conclusion is that the outcomes of the Gulf War was really a victory for the United States diplomacy in the United Nations and a victory for the United States military power and efficiency which was put at the disposal, not of the United Nations but of the resolution that is passed." Ken has also noticed that 'This situation inevitably led to the questioning of the role of the United States in the conduct both of the crisis diplomacy and of the military action when it comes. Was the operation to be defined as a United Nations operation with the United States acting as its agent, or was it essentially a unilateral American operation using the United Nations to legitimate its action?"[26]

Finally, the George Bush Senior rhetoric rediscovery of the virtues of the principled defense of national sovereignty, international law, and the United Nations serves the useful function of legitimating praetorian partnerships. In fact, the US policy in the post Cold War era was a combination of policies or strategies including both unilateral and multilateral approaches that guided the US global strategy under the Bush Senior administration as the first test to the new world after the Soviet, however, without losing the opportunity to lead the world, the US global strategy and its new world order, has been carefully carried out by the president Bush Senior to avoid the resurgence of isolationism and nativism

at home. The Cold War and its legitimate containment policy, the Soviet threat has no longer existed. The end of the Cold War already fueled the American public as nativism directed largely against the US global involvement and its economic consequences at home, domestic issues became more important than before. It has been an issue for the politicians who seek support as a candidate either to the office of the presidency or the United States Congress, an issue of Partesism - Republicans and Democrats alike. Accordingly, the early Bush senior administration has been very cautious with the fact that the United States may well turn away from hegemonic and multilateral conceptions of the new world order toward old fashioned isolationism and regionalism. This, on the other hand, has been an issue of debate that public opinion within the United States would or would not stand as firmly behind the American intervention in the world as it has been during the Cold War. Under the old post- war order, the American military intervention and or deployment outside the United States and economic multilateralism went hand in hand. However, under the new world order, the connection between military spending and or military intervention overseas and the economy is, now more complicated than before. This comes with the sense that the United States alone could not financially continue to carry out its global strategy and its military power demonstration as a tool to enforce its own agenda in the new world order.

In a report issued by the International Monetary Fund March 4, 1991, quoted by Kenneth A. Oye "An integrated Europe may look away from both the United States and Japan. More than 60 percent of the trade stays in the European Community and that ratio is bound to rise further with the EC integration in 1992. " This, as Kenneth has put it, the conjunction of heightened military and economic friction with Japan and Western Europe and the transition of the Western economy into regionalized economies may weaken the multilateral new world order.[(27)]

Despite all obstacles, the US global strategy under the George Bush Senior administration were characterized as a strategy to keep America strength as might be the only tool to protect and advance the US global leadership to prevent any challenges that might occur in the near future, even though, the Soviet threat is no longer exist. In order to do that, the Bush administration were selling its global strategy to the American public based on American interests were to determine the United States involvement in international affairs, and military reactions would be selective.[(28)] This on the

other hand, would justify the continuation of the Bush administration large military expenditures to ensure that America retained its position as the one and only universal super power of the world/ 9) On the other hand, justifying its global environment, the Bush administration relied heavily on the Pentagon to set the future objectives of the United States. Among these objectives the first was to prevent the reemergence of a new rival, so that the mission of the United States in the new era would be to prevent friends and adversaries alike from competing with the United States for the only world power status.(30) Accordingly, the United States role in the world has been redefined by the dramatic changes that occurred in the world of the post-Cold War international environment. The Gulf War of 1990-1991 and the end of the Cold War furnished the ground to the new role, most likely unilateral, of the United States global strategy. The Gulf War was characterized as a defining event in the United States global leadership and its aftermath as a new international environment. (31)

According to Ismael (1994), the Gulf War did define the United States role in the world, it did provide an "affirmative purpose", if only briefly, for it was a short war. Both its role and its purpose were pursued in the name of a new world order to be protected or to be created (32)

As a result, the Bush Senior doctrines were questioned by many that, foreign policy can be define not only by what a leaders do but also by what they fail to do. President Bush Senior's remarkable skills and leadership before and during the 1990-1991 Gulf War, his aggressive act by sending American troops into Panama to overthrow the regime of General Manuel Noriega who was brought to trial in the United States, were not counted for Bush's foreign policy success. With the former president of Iraq, the late Saddam Hussein still in power after the Gulf War of 1990-1991, and the lack of action on behalf of the United States in the conflict in Yugoslavia, raises questions of what happened to the leadership of the United States in the new world and to the diplomacy as an instrument of avoiding solving threats to world order? (33) This means undermining the critical importance of America's world role and preserving the ability to fulfill it effectively. Accordingly, the former president of the United States, George Bush Senior, despite his popularity and leadership in and outside the United States, he failed to get re-elected for the second term in office and was challenged by the democrat candidate Bill Clinton 1993-2001.

The situation in Iraq, the unfinished business, as many has refers to, the unsettled conditions in the Baltic States, namely, Yugoslavia, were viewed, as a failure United States foreign policy during the presidency of George Bush Senior especially in the election year of 1992. During the campaign year of 1992, the Bush pre-Gulf War policy were severely criticized by many as a crucial element that catalyzed the new policy occurred in presidential election politics.[(34)] These presidential politics of 1992 were the motive and demonstration to investigate the bush's foreign policy in general and the pre-Gulf War policy in particular. According to Ismael (1994), 'The continuance of Saddam Hussein in power after the Gulf War was not only embarrassment deriving from United States relation with Iraq in an election year. It became increasingly clear from the many classified documents made public through congressional investigations that the war was testimony to a glaring failure of the Bush administration's pre-war policy and how it had conducted its relations with Iraq. Bush cried politics, "pure gut politics", as the disclosures multiplied in the spring and summer of 1992 but most investigations had started before the election campaigns." [(35)] Within this context, some might argue that the domestic issues were more important to the American Public than George Bush's new world order. However, the Secretary of State under George W. Bush administration specifying scenarios of future US military role though a Pentagon draft report that "the real threat we now face is the threat of the unknown, the uncertain." That is, one cannot predict what kind of hostile force will challenge the interests and security of the United States in the future."[41] Accordingly, the use or threat to use the US military forces was and would continue to be the future policy of the United States to maintain world order? Would the United States deliberately create conditions around the world to legitimize its new role in the new world order? Was the Bush doctrine used as a grand strategy by his son Bush Junior, to establish a more aggressive preventive war doctrine?

George W. Bush and the New World Order 2001-2009

Like father like son, Bush Junior was following his father's footsteps. In his effort to define and defend the national interest and security of the United States, he was very insistent on using the US military forces when it's necessary to do so. However, unlike his father Bush Junior was insistent on

acting unilaterally relying heavily on the US military to be the US foreign policy instrument in the new era of international politics.

Diplomacy, was not an option, as they are both similar in using force as an instrument and or techniques of foreign policy objectives, Bush Senior was acting quite differently from his son's aggressive reliance on the use of force unilaterally to protect the security interests of the United States from any actual or assumed threats anytime anywhere in the world. The United States was at stake, now being changed. As Jim Hoagland (1992) has put it, the Bush seniors military involvement or Bush's defense doctrine, were limited to use force when the national interest of the United States directly threaten. According to Jim, "Bushes doctrine which surfaced as Croatians then Bosnians pressed the United States to intervene their conflict, was "I don't want to send young men into a war where I can't see that they are going to prevail and prevail rapidly"[(42)] Therefore, it is quite clear then that the reaction of Bush Senior to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait has been carried out by the Bush administration to protect the vital economic interest of the United States in the region, mainly oil. The situation in Yugoslavia did not represent the direct threat to United States interests that the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait did."[(43)] This, on the other hand, reflects the underlying promise of the Bush Senior global strategy at the time and the use of force as an instrument of solving threats to world order. That was not the case during the Bush Junior administration. The unwillingness to use force to restore order in Yugoslavia and the willingness to use force in the Gulf 1990-1991 has been changed. The situation is quite different now under the Bush Junior administration, than it was under his father's. The implications of a disturbing trend in the United States global security strategy, an increased willingness to use force has been clarified by the Bush Junior's administration that relying on the unilaterally US military forces to deal with a wide range of threats, actual and or assumed, to the United States global interests.

The 9/11th Events and the United States Global Strategy under George W. Bush 2001-2009

The Bushes (father and son) new world order was a turning point in the international politics shift that occurred after two major events. One was the collapse of the Cold War order, after the disintegration of the former Soviet Union 1991 and the other was in the wake of **9/11,** 2001 events in the United States. As mentioned before, it was George Bush who proclaimed a new world order after the collapse of the Soviet Power. Now the message from his son, Bush Junior, was "either you stand with us or against us". In an article published by the Guardian, September 14, 2001, referring to the 9/11th events and the changing in US global strategy from the time of Senior to Junior said "Now the message from an American Administration led by his son, Bush junior, said "Now the message from an American administration led by his son is that in the wake of this weeks terrorist attacks, the world has changed again. In seeking to forge a global, US-led coalition to prosecute an all-out war on terrorism, Mr. Bush and his officials are saying, in effect, that there are no neutrals any more. "(4) Secretary of State Collin Powell, one of the top Bush Junior administration officials in foreshadowing an open-ended military and diplomatic offensive, plainly expects unquestioning cooperation from all countries, great and small, that the message is "You are either for us or against us. We are going to win. Back us or you too will lose. " (46)

Accordingly, this situation demands an urgent security strategy to act immediately and decisively to protect the American people from any further threats to their safety. The illusion of safety to the Americans has furnished a ground to public support to Bush's justification to redefine threats to America and scope of measures he might employ. So was the 9/11 event a conspiracy, deliberately used to justify Bush's new role in the world? Was Bush's new world order new in the sense that America will be the judge and jury to classify the new world of "good and evil", so the "either you are with us or against us " will be the justification of Bush's junior new world role?

In an article written by Dawn Abel, (2004), citing Eric Arnow and others, reporting that, the thesis that 9/11 was a psychological operation against the American people, in order to frighten them into waging perpetual war, and to accept severe reductions in their civil liberties. Eric has pointed out that there was a great deal of doubt and unified reality surrounding the fact that the hijackers of plans like Mohammad Atta, was Muslim, his drinking and drug taking did not fit the profile of a follower of Bin Laden.(47) In the same article, cited by dawn Abel (2004), Ken Jenkins, an independent

researcher told of how 9/11 was perpetrated because of the need to replace the threat of communism with the threat of terrorism, in order to convince the public to accept the ongoing huge military expenditures. Citing from new American century.org website, Ken pointed out the view that "A new Perl Harbor" was needed to accomplish this shift in the American's public opinion. Bush himself referred to 9/11 as another Pearl Harbor.(48) Ken has added that "so the motive for the crime of 9/11 is exposed, and the means "shock and awe" events occurred. First one, then two world trade center towers hit, and then they collapsed. Their collapse, plus the collapse of world trade center 7, which wasn't even hit by the airplane instilled a deep sense of vulnerability so the public would rush for the safety of the Bush regime. We then, said Ken, had anthrax attacks, which immediately preceded the passage of the USA Patriot Act, which gutted the Bill of Rights. The means were enliting a group of people who conveniently fit the ethnicity of areas of strategic interest to the United States.(49) Mostly Muslims, Arabs and Non Arabs were also accused , who come from regions that are considered a strategic area to the United States interests as an economic and geographical ones such as Afghanistan where the accused leaders of Al- Qaida, Bin Laden residence, then Iraq's the late Saddam Hussein who also been accused of building up weapons of mass destruction and supporting terrorism, by connecting him to Bin Laden terrorist activities, which have been proved later as a false pretext made by the Bush administration officials, to justify their war against Iraq in 2003.

It is Bush's new world order, both the father and son who were very insistent to carry on their visions to the new world. First was the father's new world order after the Gulf War of 1990-1991 and second the son's new world order after the 9/11th event and its aftermath, the war on terror, and its justifications of the Afghan and Iraqi Wars. In fact, Bush junior was putting in place the new world order announced by his father after the Gulf War and the end of the Cold War order. However, to carry on his ambition to the new world order, the 9/11[1] were the unquestioned ground for Bush junior to start with. Accordingly, the post 9/11th counter- terrorism campaigns have introduced new trends into the United States national security strategy. When the attacks on New York and Washington occurred, the Bush administration was able to turn American foreign policy around very quickly. The war on terrorism, just like nuclear threats of the Cold War, provided the Bush junior administration with a practical and psychological

guide to foreign policy and the building blocks of the Bush junior new world order and the new US global strategy fell into place.

Despite the ongoing arguments and the many scenarios that have been debated by many, against the fact and or the reality of the 9/11th events, it was a turning point in the US global strategy. As Mostafa Saif (2003) has put it, "What was certain was that these events-9/llth- have caused a significant change in the security perception of the United States and resolved the national debate that existed in the 1990's on various security and defense issues. Though the United States favors multilateralism, it will act unilaterally when the international community does not work to effectuate its conceptions. The use of force can be seen to have taken on more importance, as in the US-led war on terrorism, and the strategy of mutual difference of the Cold War era has been shelved in favor of pre-emptive strikes. Regime change has also become a declared policy in dealing with states that don't conform".[(50)]

The major shift in the US global strategy and its national security policy under Bush juniors administration were the creation of the " pre-emptive strike" and the " pre-emptive war" policies adopted by the Bush junior administration as a result of the 9/11th events. Although, this shift in the United States defense strategy brought with it a new perception of threats to his time compared with nuclear threats of the past by saying "that task of defending our nation has changed dramatically. Enemies in the past needed great armies and great industrial capabilities to endanger America. Now, shadowy networks of individuals can bring great chaos and suffering to our shores for less then it costs to purchase a single tank. Terrorists are organized to penetrate open societies and turn the power of modern technologies against the United States"[(51)] The National Security strategy of 2002 identified that the major threats to the united state security might come from those states named as rogue states whose developing weapon of mass destruction, and their supports to the terrorist groups who might have access to such weapons. Accordingly, Iraq and North Korea were singled out in this 2002 national security strategy, who had also been accused as "Axis of Evil" states with which the Bush Junior administration must deal with. It said "we must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against us".[(52)]

In response to the 9/11th events, preventive war has been used in the assumption of war was inevitable, and it is better to fight now while the

costs are low rather than later when the costs are high. This policy has been used as the base to wage war against Iraq in 2003.[3] However, preemptive strike, has also been addressed by the national security strategy of the Bush administration. According to Mostafa Saif (2003) "Having achieved the main short term objective of the campaign in Afghanistan, replacing the Taliben regime with a pro-US one and undermining the Al-Qaida organization, the United States administration once again put the priority on Iraq." [(54)] Cherif Bassiouni (2003) in his article "An evolution of the US Iraq Policy" argued that 'The US military option against Iraq was strengthened by the 9/11 attacks. Even though there was no connection between Iraq and these attacks, some elements in the Bush administration sought to establish a connection between the former regime of Saddam Hussein and Al-Qaida. Tenuous as this connection is, it triggered a physiological reaction in the American public opinion, which was strengthened by Bush's speeches 9/11th 2002 at the world trade centre cite, and his speech before the United Nations general assembly on 12 September 2002. Thus, one of the consequences of illusion of perceptions is that the American public has come to see a military attack on Iraq as justified a retaliation for 9/11[1] .) despite the fact that no such connections exist between the former leader of Iraq, the late Saddam Hussein and the 9/11th events, though it had no basis, in fact it was George W. Bush's new policy of preventive strike. Therefore, the Bush administration successfully created a fabricated connection between Iraq and the 9/11th in the minds of the American public and its impact on the Congress voting for a resolution favoring United States unilateral action against Iraq. On the other hand, it was a hardly legal justification for the international community mainly the UN Security Council to consider Iraq a threat to world peace and members of the Security Council, in addition to some NATO allies opposed efforts in the Security Council for more sanctions or military action against Iraq without tangible evidence linking the Iraqi regime to the international terrorism.[(56)]

Unlike his father, during the 1990-1991 American led war against Iraq Bush junior had failed to rally international support for what he was going to do against Iraq. The passage of the Security Council Resolution 1441, November 8, 2002 returning to the previous resolution 678, 1990 authorizing the Bush senior administration use of force, did not in all means authorize the Bush - junior administration to wag war against Iraq in connection to the 9/11th event and it's false claims of connecting the Iraqi regime to it.

Accordingly, the Bush administration acted unilaterally to wage war against Iraq despite the lack of international legitimacy with the exception of the British, to its action.[(57)]

Within this context , the argument still going that despite the lack of evidence to the Iraqi 9/11th event and failure to prove the connections between the late Saddam and the Al - Qaeda network, in addition to the non-existing, fabrication, of the Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, still Iraq was part of the U.S. national security strategy during the Bush junior administration , as it has been argued by many , that the issue was unfinished business leftover by Bush Senior , so his son must do the job.[(8)]

The 2002 national security strategy adopted by the Bush - junior administration was included in a regime change. The war on Afghanistan did achieve this aim , the war on Iraq which started March 20,2003 to April 9,2003 and ended with the occupation of Baghdad , even though , the Taleban still acting , and Al- Qaeda leader - Ossama bin Laden still at large. However, the war on Iraq, March 20, 2003 ended with the occupation of Baghdad April 9, 2003 and finally the assassination of the Iraqi leader the late Saddam Hussein December 30 , 2006 .[(59)]

The Bush administration and the 2006 National Security Strategy:

his first term in office, the former president of the United States George W. Bush adopted a national security strategy that allowed him to act unilaterally and to use the US military forces abroad, claiming that he was protecting the security and interests of the United States from threats of the so-called rogue states developing weapons of mass destruction, Iraq was the case, and threatening the United States national security. In fact, he did use the military forces to occupy Afghanistan and Iraq and to change the regimes of Taliban and Saddam. However, in his second term in office he adopted the 2006 national security strategy and a new so-called Rogue States occurred in Bush's strategy. Syria and Iran were targeted by the Bush administration as states sponsoring terrorism, and in this case Iran, developing weapons of mass destruction. As for Syria, the Bush administration in response to the 9/11th 2002 event, expected Syria ,which had condemned Al-Qaeda organization, to act against Hamas of Palestine and Hizbullah of Lebanon and to decide on which side of the war against terrorism it's on.[(60)] However in his 2006 national security strategy, President

Bush still claimed that "Syria continued to harbor terrorists at home and sponsor terrorist activities abroad. "(61)

In an article published by the Guardian, October 29, 2008, titled, "Gorge Bush Will Soon Be Free To Do Just What He Wants", Jonathan Freedland noted that, before he leaves office, Bush still using military power to enforce his 2006 national security strategy and how he plans to use his final days in the White House , when US forces crossed the Iraqi border into Syria to kill Al -Qaeda member, a man they said had been funneling "foreign fitters" allied to Al-Qaeda into Iraq . According to Jonathan , this was a deliberate act, calculated to send a series of messages to many in general and to the Syrian in particular reminding them who is "boss in the region" and strong dash arming them to do more to crack down on Al-Qeda."(62)

As of the case of Iran, the Bush 2006 strategy described Iran in the senses that "we may face no greater challenge from a single country than from Iran. This not only because of its attempts to develop nuclear weapons, but also because of broader concerns. The Iranian regime sponsors terrorism, threatens Israel, seeks to oppose Middle East peace, disrupts democracy in Iraq, and denies the aspirations of its people for freedom."[63]

It is quite clear that the Bushes , father and son , global strategies where nothing but the determination of both former presidents to establish a new role for the United States in a new world order since the 1990's, based upon the unilateral use of force as an instrument of their foreign policy objectives. According to Geoff Simon (2003), once the 2003 American war against Iraq was over, many have questioned " what will the new next American wars be" and the role of the US military power as an instrument to be used to establish an American empire of the world . Quoting Andrew J. Bacevich, Jeff has noted that "the question is not whether the United States has become an empire, but what kind of empire the American wants it to be."(4)

War has become an attractive habitat to the United States, under the Bushes administrations. It has been recognized by many all over the world. However, for the Arab world, according to Mostafa (2003) "a United States invasion of Iraq would be construed in the Arab world as a policy of securing United States hegemony in the region. Solidifying the United States hold on the region's oil reserves ; serving the strategic interests of Israel and killing the Palestenian national dream of establishing an independent state.

Such consequences would be difficult for the Arab regimes to endure, and whether or not some are compelled to search for new sources of political legitimacy, it would be critical for the whole Arab world ."[65]

Finally, despite the reality of who was behind the 9/1 1* events, who planned it and executed it, what are his direct short term and long term objectives of it. Still according to Mohammad Deyab (2002) the United States will benefit from the golden opportunity that the events provide to it go ahead with its already stated strategy that have been planned since the early 1990's right after the collapse of the former Soviet Union 1991, in which a new geopolitical map to Mid-Asia and other parts of East Europe as part of a geopolitical importance to the United States national interests and its efforts to establish a new world order under its leadership.

Conclusion

With the sudden but peaceful end of the Cold War in 1991, the United States undoubtedly saw a golden opportunity to act freely from now on, and to make a massive show of force so as to enhance its new post Cold War role on a world scale. In this light, the United States new world policy has been carried out by the former President of the United States, George Bush Senior, in the sense that, the United States must continue to be involved in the world.

No doubt, too, that the target was the Third World, both nationalist regimes that sought to act without the United States approval will be targeted as a rogue states and potential disturbers of the Bushes new world order. The United States has major economic, regional geopolitical and world imperial interests in deterring and stopping those who might oppose the United States policy, and it should act, by all means, including the use of military forces to secure these interests. Accordingly, it is difficult to avoid the fact that the Bushes, both senior and junior, went to war against Iraq, 1990-1991 and 2003, because they believe it placed challenges on projecting United States power in a world scale in the aftermath of the Cold War. This US policy appears almost certain to bring counter productive consequences for capitalist interests, most notably those of the United States. This, on the other hand, would lead to argue that the collapse of the Soviet Power would appear to have made the projection of the expansion of United States military power less necessary. In deed, the United States, under the Bushes administration were willing to pay a very high price in terms of honoring the

United States sphere of influence in particular, and recognizing US imperial interests in particular. Although, it is difficult to avoid the fact that the Bushes saw the continued build up of military strength as the only way of maintaining the appearance of the US power and hegemony. The Bushes administration had probably achieved as close to a Pax Americana by its new world order and the United States as the world's policeman. Despite the fact that the Bush Senior administration was criticized for lacking a global vision, for responding to specific international situations, With the exception of the 1990-1991 Gulf War, but failing to develop a global plan charting a decisive course in international relations. Thus there has been no effective strategy for building long-term constructive economic, political, and cultural relations, a global policy that is vital in view of the importance role of the United States in the world, still the US global strategy and the new world order since it was announced by President Bush senior 1991 until the end of Bush junior's Presidency 2009, has been categorized as a policy of dominations, supported by the policy of continuing military superiority and readiness to intervene any time anywhere in the world as an instrument of its foreign policy and global role and objectives.

Finally, The National Security Strategies of 2002 and 2006 has been adopted by the Bush junior administration to legitimize the free hand of the United States use of force to dictate its policy on the world in general, and on the Third World in particular, including the Arab world. The still doubted, still questioned 9711th 2001 events have been used to legitimize the United States false allegation of fighting terrorism and gaining sympathy of its allies and dictating, by the threat of force its agenda on those who oppose it. The war on terror transformation is more than an ordinary adoption, it implies a major transformation on the US global strategy in the sense of "Either you stand with us or against us" and "Back us or you too will lose". The United States is now justifying its global strategy of dictating the world. Since its invasion of Afghanistan and then Iraq 2003 and the failure to find either weapons of mass destruction (WMD) or evidence of a connection between the late Saddam Hussein and the 9/11 , the Bush-junior preventive war and preemptive strike policies has been shaken. So the question remains, what was the hidden agenda of the Bushes both, father and son. What was the Bushes number one foreign policy priority? Indeed, it will remain so far as long as it should be, in the heart and mind of many people in the Arab and Muslim worlds to acknowledge or understand that the reality, whether they

can do so, given America's present mood, will give them a first measure of Mr. Bush , the father, and his son crusading the new world.

Endnotes

1. Domhoff, G.Wiliam (2005). There Are No Conspiracies, "New World Order"_conspiracy theory". Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, see:http//sociology.USSC.edu/whorulesamerica/theory/conspiracy.ht ml. p.l

2. Barkun, Michael, (2003). A culture of conspiracy: Apocalyptic Visions in Contemporary America, University of California, U.S.A, p.2-6.

3. Wiarda, Howard j.(1996) U.S. Foreign and Strategic Policy in the Post_ ColdWarEra, London, Greenwood Press.P. 1

4. Ibid,p.l

5. Reus, Smit (2005) "constructivism" Theories of International Relations.ed.ScottBurchill.palgravePP.202-

216. See.http://en. wikipedia.org.

6. Viotti , Paul R. and Kauppi, Markv.(1987)"Realism, the State, Power, and Balance of Power". International Relations Theory, Macmillan publishing, ine. U.S.A.

7. Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), 127-69.

8. Jones, Walter S. (1988).The Logic of International Relations, Library of Congress,U.S.A,P.257.

9. Viotti, paul R .(1987) Opcit,pp.43-44.

10. Jones(1988)Opcit,P.51

11. William R Hawkins,(1991)"Isolationism ,Properly Understood", The National Interests 24,Summer 1991,U.S.A p.61

12. Owen Harries, (1991)"Drift and Mastery, BUSH Style", The National Interest. Spring 1991, U.S.A, P.5.

13. Joseph Sobran (1994) quoted, Taregy. Ismael. "The Gulf War and the New World Order ".Florida University Press, U.S.A.P.195.

14. Ibid,P199

15. Thomas Friedman (1992) "Rethinking Foreign Affairs: Are They Still a U.S Affairs" New York Times, February, 1992.

16. Kenneth A. Oye (1992) Eagle in a New World: America Grand Strategy in the Post Cold War Era, Harper Collins Publishers, U.S.A.P24.

17. Ibid.PP24-25.

18. "America Only"(1992) editorial ,New York Times, 10 March, 1992.P.A.24,

19. Ibid,p.A24

20. Kenneth,Opcit,P.27

21. Ibid,P.27

22. Ibid,PP.27-29

23. "Towards a New World Order ",address by President Bush before a joint session of Congress, 11 September, 1990, U.S. Department of State DisPatch,U.S.A,P.91

24. "Defeating Aggression in Kuwait ",Radio addressed by President Bush ,2 March ,1991,US Dept. of State Dispatch, 11 March , 1991,U.S. AP. 164.

25. Ken Matthews (1993) .The Gulf Conflict and International Relations, London and New York US.A,P.89

26. Ibid,P.89

27. Kenneth,Opcit,P.28

28. Ibid,P.29

29. Patrick Tyler (1992) "U.S Strategy Plan Calls for Insuring No Rivals Develop: A one-Super Power world", New York Times.8 March, 1992.

30. "America Only" editorial, 1992, Opcit, March 10,1992.

31. Patrick Tyler, Opcit, NYT. 11 March. 1992.

32. "Excerpts From Pentagons Plan: Prevent the Re-Emergence of a New Rival", New York Times, 8 March, 1992.

33. Tareq Y. Ismael (1994) The Gulf War and the New World Order, Florida University, U.S.A, P.200.

34. Jim Hoagland (1992) "Yugoslavia: A gain, Bush Should Have Charted a Middle Course ", International Herald Tribune, 18 June, 1992, quoting a statement mode by Bush during a television interview on 7 January 1992.

35. Leslie H. Gelb," Now Bush Gets Tough on Saddam " International Herald Tribune ,24 August, 1992,

36. Tareq Y. Ismael (1994) Opcit, p.210.

37. Ibid P.200

38. James Kurth (1991) "Things to come :The Shape of the New World Order ",The National Interest 24,(Summer 1991) p.4

39. Owen Harries (1991) Opcit ,p.6-7

40. Noam Chomsky (1991) "The New World Order ",Bates College Lecture,30 January 1991,Open Magazine Pamphlet Series U.S.A p.24

41. Ibid,p.24

42. Jim Hoagland, Opcit (1992)

43. Ibid

44. Ibid

45. "Bush's New World Order "(2001) Special report :terrorism in the U.S, The Guardian ,UK 2001,P.l-6,quted from http://www.guardian.co.UK.sep/14/2001 .P. 1-6

46. Ibid,p. 1-6

47. Eric Arnow (2004) "9/11 Report" quoted by Dawn Abel (2004) "Exposing the Truth ",p. 1-5,quoted from http://www.bibiotecapleyades.net/SocioPoltica/esp_Sociopol_9 111 9.htm.

48. Ken Jenkins (2004) quoted Ibid,p.52.

49. Ibid P.2

50. مصطفى سيف (٢٠٠٣)، مقال منشور في مجلة السياسة الدولية في اللغة الإنجليزية بعنوان

"The Events Of 11 September and the Middle East Security"

مجلة السياسة الدولية العدد ١٥١ يناير ٢٠٠٣، ص. ١٦.

51. The U.S National Security Strategy Of (2002) adopted by President

George W. Bush, released 17 September 2002, The White House, Government Printing Office, U.S.A, 2002, P. 14.

52. Ibid, P, 14.

53. John Lewis (2002) A grand Strategy of transformation, Foreign Policy,

vol.133, U.S.A, PP. 50, 58

٥٤. مصطفى سيف (٢٠٠٣) مرجع سابق، ص ١٨.

٥٥. شريف بسيوني (٢٠٠٣) مقال منشور في مجلة السياسة الدولية باللغة الإنجليزية بعنوان "An Evaluation Of the United Stated, Iraq Police" مجلة السياسة الدولية، العدد ١٥١، يناير ٢٠٠٣، ص ١١.

٥٦. المرجع السابق، ص ١١.

٥٧. جيف سيمونز (٢٠٠٣) عراق المستقبل "السياسة الأمريكية في إعادة تشكيل الشرق الأول، ترجمة سعيد العظم، دار الساقي، بيروت، لبنان ٢٠٠٤. ص ٢٤٨.

٥٨. المرجع السابق، ص ١١.

٥٩.ستيفان هالبروجوناثان كلارك (٢٠٠٥) التفرد الأمريكي، "المحافظون الجدد والنظام العالمي" ترجمة عمر الأيوبي، دار الكتاب العربي، بيروت. ص ٢٦٠.

٦٠. مصطفى سيف، مرجع سابق، ص ١٨.

61. The National Security Strategy Of the United States (2006) .The White

House,P.9

62. Jonathan Freedland (2008) "George Bush, Will Soon Be Free To Do Just What He Wants". The Guardian, UK quoted from http://www.bibiotecaplevades.net/sociopolitia/esp_Sociopol_bush 3 8.htm.

63. U.S National Security Strategy (2006) Opcit,P.20

٦٤. جيف سيمونز، مرجع سابق، ص ٤٣٢.

٦٥. مصطفى سيف، مرجع سابق، ص ١٩٠.

٦٦. محمد ذيات، الصراع على الثروات في آسيا الوسطى والقوقاز "الاستراتيجية الأمريكية في المنطقة، شئون الأوسط، العدد ١٠٥، شتاء ٢٠٠٢، ص ١٠٠